

Consolidated State Application September 1, 2003 Submission

**for State Grants under Title IX, Part C, Section 9302 of the Elementary and
Secondary Education Act (Public Law 107-110)**

Due: September 1, 2003



**U. S. Department of Education
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
Washington, D.C. 20202**

Instructions for Completing the Consolidated State Application September 1, 2003 Submission

As described in the May 7, 2002, Consolidated State Application Package, States' submissions of their consolidated applications have been divided into multiple submissions and information requests. The information States are to provide in their September 1, 2003, consolidated applications is listed below.

Summary of Information Required for September 1, 2003 Submission

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for ESEA GOALS AND ESEA INDICATORS

Performance Goal 2: All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.

- 2.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of limited English proficient students, determined by cohort, who have attained English proficiency by the end of the school year.

Performance goal 3: By 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.

- 3.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of classes being taught by "highly qualified" teachers (as the term is defined in section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in "high-poverty" schools (as the term is defined in section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA).
- 3.2 Performance indicator: The percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development (as the term, "professional development," is defined in section 9101 (34)).
- 3.3 Performance indicator: The percentage of paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified. (See criteria in section 1119(c) and (d)).

Performance goal 4: All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.

- 4.1 Performance indicator: The number of persistently dangerous schools, as defined by the State.

Performance Goal 5: All students will graduate from high school.

- 5.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of students who graduate from high school each year with a regular diploma.
- 5.2 Performance indicator: The percentage of students who drop out of school.

This workbook format has been developed to facilitate preparation and submission of the information required in this September 1, 2003, submission. States may use this format or another format of their choosing provided that all required information is provided in a clear and concise manner. The deadline for submission of this application is September 1, 2003.

Transmittal Instructions

To expedite the receipt of this September 1, 2003, Consolidated State Application submission, please send your submission via the Internet as a .doc file, pdf file, rtf or .txt file or provide the URL for the site where your submission is posted on the Internet. Send electronic submissions to conapp@ed.gov.

A State that submits only a paper submission should mail the submission by express courier to:

Celia Sims
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Ave., SW
Room 3W300
Washington, D.C. 20202-6400
(202) 401-0113

ESEA GOALS and ESEA INDICATORS

Performance Indicator 2.1: The percentage of limited English proficient students, determined by cohort, who have attained English proficiency by the end of the school year.

For this September 1, 2003, Consolidated State Application submission, States must report information related to their standards and assessments for English language proficiency and baseline data and performance targets for ESEA Performance Indicator 2.1.

A. English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards and Assessments

Please describe the status of the State's efforts to establish ELP standards that relate to the development and attainment of English proficiency by limited English proficient students. Specifically, describe how the State's ELP standards:

- Address grades K through 12
- Address the four domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing
- Are linked to the academic content and achievement standards in reading/language arts and mathematics, and in science (by 2005-2006)

STATE RESPONSE

Because of a variety of reasons, including a state budget crisis this year, Tennessee was not able to revise its current ELD Standards to meet Title III requirements. However, at the present time, Tennessee has ESL Standards in place, accessible at: <http://www.state.tn.us/education/ci/cicurframwkm1.htm>. These standards are based on TESOL standards and were developed in alignment with state Language Arts standards. The assessment that is currently in use to assess English Language Proficiency, the IDEA Proficiency Test (IPT), is also aligned with TESOL Standards. The ESL Standards address grades K-12, in grade span configurations of K-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12. The domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing are addressed, based on three goals, 9 standards, and multiple performance indicators according to grade span.

Tennessee is part of the English Proficiency for All Students (EPAS) consortium with four other states, plus Educational Testing Service (ETS) and AccountabilityWorks, to develop an enhanced assessment for English Language Proficiency. The project is designed to help states assess English Language Learners (ELL) by analyzing state standards, establishing content benchmarks, and developing standards-based assessments drawn from scientific research. The project timeline indicated a beginning date of December 2002, with one of the first processes being the detailed analysis of state standards in reading and Language Arts, as well as English proficiency. Researchers, ESL education experts, and practitioners were to begin drafting content and skills benchmarks and test specifications for the assessments to be reviewed by consortium states.

This process was to have been the initial phase of our English Language Development (ELD) Standards, aligned with state content standards and aligned from the beginning with the new assessment that will be the end product. This process was scheduled for completion by the end of February 2003.

As of this date, no progress has been made. The consortium funding was delayed when Pennsylvania, the lead state, did not receive the award letter. It has been further delayed with a change in fiscal agents within the consortium. The projected completion date for the EPAS consortium project is August 2004, with initial baseline data collection in September 2004. No changes have been forthcoming for the completion time because of the delay in implementation of the timeline.

The state has approached ETS for additional support in the development of an alternative mathematics assessment and standards setting for ELLs.

Following ELD Standards and Math standards for ELLs, science will follow for 2005-2006.

B. Baseline Data for Performance Indicator 2.1

In the following table, please provide English language proficiency (ELP) baseline data from the 2002-2003 school year test administration. English language proficiency baseline data should include all students in the State who were identified as limited English proficient by State-selected English language proficiency assessments, regardless of student participation in Title III supported programs.

1. The ELP baseline data should include the following:

- Total number of students identified as LEP by each State-selected ELP assessment(s);
- Total number and percentage of LEP students at each level of English language proficiency as defined by State ELP standards and ELP assessments; and
- A list of each of the ELP assessment(s) used to determine level of English language proficiency.

2. The baseline data should:

- Indicate all levels of English language proficiency; and
- Be aggregated at the State level.
- If a State is reporting data using an ELP composite score (e.g., a total score that consists of a sum or average of scores in the domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension), the State must:
 - Describe how the composite score was derived;
 - Describe how all five domains of English language proficiency were incorporated into the composite score; and
 - Describe how the domains were weighted to develop the composite score.

States may use the sample format below or another format to report the required information.

Baseline Data for 2002-2003					
ELP Assessment(s)	Total number of LEP Identified	Number and Percentage at Basic or Level 1	Number and Percentage at Intermediate or Level 2	Number and Percentage at Advanced or Level 3	Number and Percentage at Proficient or Level 4
(1)*	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
		13,514	270	12,266	978

*

(1) List all of the State-selected ELP assessment(s) used during the 2002-2003 school year to assess LEP students.

(2) Total number of students identified as LEP according to ELP assessments(s).

(3-6) Number and percentage of students at each level of English language proficiency, as defined by State ELP standards and ELP assessments. If the State uses labels such as Level 1, Level 2, etc., the level at which students are designated "Proficient" should be indicated. For example, in this sample format, students at Level 4 are considered proficient in English. States should use the same ELP labels as defined in State ELP standards and assessment(s). If the ELP standards and assessment(s) define more than four levels, the table should be expanded to incorporate all levels.

Please provide the following additional information:

1. English language proficiency assessment(s) used, including the grades and domains addressed by each assessment (e.g., IDEA Oral Language Proficiency Test (IPT I), grades K-6, listening and speaking).

Transitional students (T1 and T2) are new categories this year. T1 will begin to be reported for the 2003/2004 school year, T2 will be reported in 2004/2005. Those designations will be based on IPT-FEP categories this year.

Level 6: Proficient will be reported after T1 and T2 years, beginning in 2005/2006.

2. Total number of students **assessed** for English language proficiency on State-selected ELP assessment(s) (number of students referred for assessment and evaluated using State-selected ELP assessments).

This is a segment of our end of year data collection and was not included in the IPT data collection. This number will be available by December 1, 2003. A revised chart with totals will be resubmitted at that time.

3. Total number of students **identified** as LEP on State-selected ELP assessment(s) (number of students determined to be LEP on State-selected ELP assessment(s)).

15,007 LEP Students were reported for the 2002/2003 school year. However, some scores were not collected due to an internet virus that affected some districts, and some test scores not being available at this date. 13,514 IPT scores were collected and those scores are reported in the chart.

C. Performance Targets (Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives) for English Language Proficiency

Section 3122(a)(3) requires that States' annual measurable achievement objectives for English language proficiency include annual increases in the number or percentage of children attaining English proficiency. Please provide the State's definition of "proficient" in English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards. Please include in your response:

- The test score range or cut scores for each of the State's ELP assessments
- A description of how the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension are incorporated or weighted in the State's definition of "proficient" in English.

STATE RESPONSE

Tennessee's definition of **Fluent English proficient**: - non-English language background students who show no difficulty in regular classroom performance and meet one of the following criteria:

1. upon initial enrollment in a Tennessee public school, scored Fluent English Proficient on all subsections of the state approved English Language Proficiency assessment; or,
2. initially qualified as limited English proficient based on the state approved English Language Proficiency assessment, received English as a Second Language services, and has now scored proficient or above for two (2) consecutive years on the state approved English Language Proficiency assessment; or,
3. demonstrated the ability to meet the State's proficient or above proficient level of achievement on State assessment described in section 1111(b)(3) for reading and language arts.

All domains are equally weighted. In order to be designated as **IPT-NEP**, a student must score as non-English speaker, non-English reader, and non-English writer. A score in the limited or fluent range in any subtest section indicates a designation of Limited English proficient: **IPT-LEP**. After testing Fluent English Proficient (FEP) on the IPT in all subsections of the assessment, an ELL is reported as **IPT-FEP**. The student is then monitored for two additional years, indicated as **Transitional 1 (T1)** and **Transitional 2 (T2)**, and must test proficient or above for each of the two transitional years in order to be reclassified as Fluent English **Proficient** for grade level classroom purposes and to be exited from the ESL program.

Section 3122(a)(3) requires that States' annual measurable achievement objectives for English language proficiency include annual increases in the number or percentage of children making progress in learning English. Please provide the State's definition of "making progress" in learning English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments. Please include in your response:

- **A description of the English language proficiency levels and any sub-levels as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments**
- **A description of the criteria students must meet to progress from one proficiency level to the next (e.g., narrative descriptions, cut scores, formula, data from multiple sources)**
- **A description of the language domains in which students must make progress in moving from one English language proficiency level to the next**

STATE RESPONSE

There are six proficiency levels leading from non-English proficient to fully English proficient. They are designated as **NEP**, **LEP**, **FEP**, **T1**, **T2**, and **Proficient**. The description that follows indicates the degree of language necessary for each designation:

In order to be designated as **IPT-NEP**, a student must score as non-English speaker, non-English reader, and non-English writer. A score in the limited or fluent range in any subtest section indicates a designation of Limited English proficient: **IPT-LEP**. After testing Fluent English Proficient (FEP) on the IPT in all subsections of the assessment, an ELL is reported as **IPT-FEP**. The student is then monitored for two additional years, indicated as **Transitional 1 (T1)** and **Transitional 2 (T2)**, and must test proficient or above for each of the two transitional years in order to be reclassified as Fluent English **Proficient** for grade level classroom purposes and to be exited from the ESL program.

Title III Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Guidelines for Measuring Annual Progress in English Language Proficiency

Tennessee has adopted the IDEA Proficiency Test (IPT), published by Ballard & Tighe, for use state-wide for assessing the English proficiency of students who enter school with a primary home language other than English. In light of the assessment requirements established by the *No Child Left Behind Act*, Ballard & Tighe have developed guidelines for measuring adequate yearly progress of LEP students' English proficiency in listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Tennessee has adopted these guidelines.

The following charts are based on normative data generated by IPT field studies and are guidelines to determine ELL students' progress in English language learning and attainment of English listening, speaking, reading, and writing proficiency.

[IPT-ORAL \(Listening & Speaking\) TESTS](#)

Test Grades Expected Progress in Listening & Speaking Proficiency*

IPT I-Oral K-6 One test level** for each year of instruction

IPT II-Oral 6-12 One test level** for each year of instruction

*Based on data from a study of Title VII Bilingual Education evaluations.

** e.g., A, B, C, D, E, or F.

[IPT-READING TESTS](#)

Test Grades Expected Progress in Reading Proficiency*

IPT 1 Reading 2-3 5 raw score points for each year of instruction

IPT 2 Reading 4-6 5 raw score points for each year of instruction

IPT 3 Reading 7-12 5 raw score points for each year of instruction

*Based on a change score analysis of the Total Reading Mean Scores of the IPT Reading Tests 1, 2, and 3.

[IPT-WRITING TESTS](#)

Test Grades Expected Progress in Writing Proficiency

IPT 1 Writing 2-3 One rubric level for each year of instruction*

IPT 2 Writing 4-6 One rubric level for each year of instruction*

IPT 3 Writing 7-12 One rubric level for each year of instruction*

*Each of the three writing samples is rated according to a four-point rubric. The total of the rating points for all three writing samples is then calculated. It is reasonable to expect the total to increase one rating point for each year of instruction.

In the table that follows, please provide performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for:

- The percentage or number of LEP students who will make progress in learning English
- The percentage or number of LEP students who will attain English language proficiency

Performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives are projections for increases in the percentage or number of LEP students who will make progress in learning English and who will attain English language proficiency.

A table has been provided to accommodate States' varying approaches for establishing their performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives. Some States may establish the same performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for all grade levels in the State. Other States may establish separate performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for elementary, middle, and high school, for example. If a State establishes different performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives for different grade levels/grade spans/cohorts, the State should complete a separate table for each grade level/grade span/cohort and indicate next to the "unit of analysis/cohort" the grade level/grade span/cohort to which the performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives apply.

Please provide the State's definition of cohort(s). Include a description of the specific characteristics of the cohort(s) in the State, e.g., grade/grade span or other characteristics.

STATE RESPONSE

For the purpose of defining cohort, each grade level will be a separate cohort and will be tracked for progress. The cohort will be heterogeneous, some NEP, some LEP, some FEP, and some T1/T2. That will allow Tennessee to demonstrate ELL progress over time; students will exit at varying times because they entered at different levels of proficiency.

The chart for making progress/gaining proficiency in English is based on our IPT assessment results, not the ELD Standards. The ELD Standards are still in process of development and will not be finalized as policy until sometime within the school year 2003/2004.

Tennessee does not have longitudinal data on the IPT and student success as the IPT was adopted as the sole assessment of language proficiency in 2002/2003. It's possible that changes/adjustments will be made within the next year as the alternative assessment is developed and put into usage. For now, Tennessee has considered data provided by Ballard & Tighe, the IPT publishers, and Tennessee data on student progress from the last two years, which was based on five different assessments of language proficiency as the best data for determining English language proficiency performance targets and annual measurable achievement objectives.

English Language Proficiency Performance Targets/Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives

***Unit of Analysis/Cohort: Each Grade Level**

(Note: States should specify the defining characteristics of each cohort addressed, e.g., grades/grade spans)

English Language Proficiency Targets	Percent or Number of LEP Students Making Progress in Acquiring English Language Proficiency	Percent or Number of LEP Students Attaining English Language Proficiency
2003-2004 School Year	30%	13%
2004-2005 School Year	37%	21.7%
2005-2006 School Year	44%	30.4%
2006-2007 School Year	51%	39.1%
2007-2008 School Year	58%	47.8%
2008-2009 School Year	65%	56.5%
2009-2010 School Year	72%	65.2%
2010-2011 School Year	79%	73.9%
2011-2012 School Year	86%	82.6%
2012-2013 School Year	93%	91.3%
2013-2014 School Year	100%	100%

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 3, Performance Indicator 3.1: The percentage of classes being taught by “highly qualified” teachers (as the term is defined in section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in “high-poverty” schools (as the term is defined in section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA).

NCLB places a major emphasis upon teacher quality as a factor in improving student achievement. The new Title II programs focus on preparing, training, and recruiting high-quality teachers and principals and requires States to develop plans with annual measurable objectives that will ensure that all teachers teaching in core academic subjects are highly qualified by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.

The requirement that teachers be highly qualified, as defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA, applies to public elementary and secondary school teachers teaching in core academic subjects. (The term “core academic subjects” means English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography (*Section 9101(11)*). For more detailed information on highly qualified teachers, please refer to the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/SIP/TitleIIguidance2002.doc>

A. In the following chart, please provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of classes in the core academic subjects being taught by “highly qualified” teachers (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in “high-poverty” schools (as the term is defined in Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA). Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines “high-poverty” schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State.

For baseline data, please indicate the percentage of classes in core academic subjects taught by “highly qualified” teachers both in the aggregate for the State and for high-poverty schools in the State in the 2002-2003 school year. For targets, please indicate the percentage of classes in core academic subjects that will be taught by highly qualified teachers by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.

Baseline Data and Targets	Percentage of Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers State Aggregate	Percentage of Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers High-Poverty Schools
2002-2003 Baseline*	33.9	34.8
2003-2004 Target	58.9	59.8
2004-2005 Target	83.9	84.8
2005-2006 Target	100.0	100.0

*Tennessee's baseline data is based on a limited assessment of readily available test data at the State Department of Education. School systems have only begun verifying the Highly Qualified status of their teachers in the current school year. **Revised figures 11-25-03**

B. To best understand the data provided by States, please provide the State's definition of a highly qualified teacher below.

The definition is contained in the State Board of Education's approved document that is available at: <http://www.tennessee.gov/education/mnclb.htm>.

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 3, Performance Indicator 3.2: The percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development (as the term, “professional development,” is defined in section 9101 (34).)

In the following chart, please provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development. The term “high-quality professional development” means professional development that meets the criteria outlined in the definition of professional development in Title IX, Section 9101(34) of ESEA. For more detailed information on high-quality professional development, please refer to the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/SIP/TitleIguidance2002.doc>

For baseline data, please indicate the percentage of teachers who received “high-quality professional development” in the 2002-2003 school year. For targets, please indicate the percentage of teachers who will receive “high-quality professional development” through the 2005-2006 school year. The data for this element should include all public elementary and secondary school teachers in the State.

Baseline Data and Targets	Percentage of Teachers Receiving High-Quality Professional Development
2002-2003 Baseline	49.1
2003-2004 Target	66.1
2004-2005 Target	83.1
2005-2006 Target	100.0

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 3, Performance Indicator 3.3: The percentage of paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified. (See criteria in section 1119(c) and (d).)

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 defines a qualified paraprofessional as an employee who provides instructional support in a program supported by Title I, Part A funds who has (1) completed two years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Section 1119(c) and (d).) For more information on qualified paraprofessionals, please refer to the Title I paraprofessionals Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/SASA/paraguidance.doc>

In the following chart, please provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified. For baseline data, please indicate the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals who were qualified, as defined above, in the 2002-2003 school year. For targets, please indicate the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals who will be qualified by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.

Baseline Data and Targets	Percentage of Qualified Title I Paraprofessionals
2002-2003 Baseline	40.8
2003-2004 Target	60.5
2004-2005 Target	80.2
2005-2006 Target	100.0

Baseline data and performance targets for Goal 4, Performance Indicator 4.1: The number of persistently dangerous schools, as defined by the State.

In the following chart, please provide baseline data and targets for the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous as determined by the State. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, please refer to the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OSDFS/unsafeschoolchoice.doc>.

For baseline data, please provide the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous by the start of the 2003-2004 school year. For performance targets, please provide the number of schools that will be identified as persistently dangerous through the 2013-2014 school year.

Baseline Data and Targets	Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools
2003-2004 Baseline	0
2004-2005 Target	0
2005-2006 Target	0
2006-2007 Target	0
2007-2008 Target	0
2008-2009 Target	0
2009-2010 Target	0
2010-2011 Target	0
2011-2012 Target	0
2012-2013 Target	0
2013-2014 Target	0

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 5, Performance Indicator 5.1: The percentage of students who graduate from high school each year with a regular diploma, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.

In the May 7, 2002, Consolidated State Application Package, indicator 5.1 read: “The percentage of students who graduate from high school each year with a regular diploma – disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged—calculated in the same manner as used in National Center for Education Statistics reports on Common Core of Data.” However, section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the No Child Left Behind Act on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:

- The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of the school year, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State’s academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,
- Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and
- Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.

The Secretary approved each State’s definition of the graduation rate, consistent with section 200.19 of the Title I regulations, as part of each State’s accountability plan. To reduce burden, provide flexibility, and promote more consistent data collection by the Department, we ask that the information you submit in this September 1, 2003, consolidated State application reflect this Title I definition rather than the definition used in the NCES Common Core of Data.

Using the definition of the graduation rate that was approved as part of your State’s accountability plan, in the following charts please provide baseline data and performance targets for the graduation rate. For baseline data, please provide the graduation rate for the 2001-2002 school year. For performance targets, please indicate what the State graduation rate will be through the 2013-2014 school year.

Baseline Data: GRADUATION RATE

High School Graduates	High School Graduation Rate	High School Graduation Rate
Student Group	01-02 Baseline	02-03 Baseline
All Students	75.7%	76.1%
African American/Black	59.3	60.6
American Indian/Native Alaskan	76.3	78.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	82.3	81.5
Hispanic	64.7	63.8
White	81.2	81.1
Other		
Students with Disabilities		
Students without Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Non-Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male		
Female		

PERFORMANCE TARGETS: GRADUATION RATE

High School Graduates	02-03 School Year	03-04 School Year	04-05 School Year	05-06 School Year	06-07 School Year	07-08 School Year	08-09 School Year	09-10 School Year	10-11 School Year	11-12 School Year	12-13 School Year	13-14 School Year
Student Group												
All Students	60.0	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	100.0
African American/Black	60.0	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	100.0
American Indian/Native Alaskan	60.0	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	100.0
Asian/Pacific Islander	60.0	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	100.0
Hispanic	60.0	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	100.0
White	60.0	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	100.0
Other	60.0	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	100.0
Students with Disabilities	60.0	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	100.0
Students without Disabilities	60.0	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	100.0
Limited English Proficient	60.0	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	100.0
Economically Disadvantaged	60.0	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	100.0
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	60.0	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	100.0
Migrant	60.0	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	100.0
Male	60.0	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	100.0
Female	60.0	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	100.0

To meet adequate yearly progress for graduation rate, schools and districts must meet a baseline of 60.0% and show progress toward meeting the 100.0% graduation rate.

Baseline Data and Performance Targets for Goal 5, Performance Indicator 5.2: The percentage of students who drop out of school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.

For purposes of calculating and reporting a dropout rate for this performance indicator, States should use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistics' (NCES) Common Core of Data.

Consistent with this requirement, States must use NCES' definition of "high school dropout," An individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a state- or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or state- or district approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.

In the following charts, please provide baseline data and targets for the percentage of students who drop out of high school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged. For baseline data, in the following charts please indicate the State high school dropout rate for the 2001-2002 school year. For targets, please indicate the State high school dropout rate through the 2013-2014 school year.

BASELINE DATA: DROPOUT RATE

Student Dropouts	Student Dropout Rate	Student Dropout Rate
Student Group	01-02 Baseline	02-03 Baseline
All Students	3.5%	3.0%
African American/Black	6.8	4.9
American Indian/Native Alaskan	2.6	4.1
Asian/Pacific Islander	3.1	2.4
Hispanic	5.5	5.3
White	2.5	2.4
Other		
Students with Disabilities		
Students without Disabilities		
Limited English Proficient		
Economically Disadvantaged		
Non-Economically Disadvantaged		
Migrant		
Male	4.0	3.4
Female	3.0	2.6

PERFORMANCE TARGETS: DROPOUT RATE

Student Dropouts	02-03 School Year	03-04 School Year	04-05 School Year	05-06 School Year	06-07 School Year	07-08 School Year	08-09 School Year	09-10 School Year	10-11 School Year	11-12 School Year	12-13 School Year	13-14 School Year
Student Group												
All Students	3.00	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	0.00
African American/Black	3.00	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	0.00
American Indian/Native Alaskan	3.00	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	0.00
Asian/Pacific Islander	3.00	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	0.00
Hispanic	3.00	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	0.00
White	3.00	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	0.00
Other	3.00	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	0.00
Students with Disabilities	3.00	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	0.00
Students without Disabilities	3.00	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	0.00
Limited English Proficient	3.00	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	0.00
Economically Disadvantaged	3.00	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	0.00
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	3.00	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	0.00
Migrant	3.00	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	0.00
Male	3.00	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	0.00
Female	3.00	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	0.00

*To make a 60% graduation rate, schools and districts would need to have a minimum 3.0% event drop out rate and show progress to decreasing that until 2013-2014 when the event drop out rate would need to be 0.0%.